Application Serial No.: 09/965,745 Attorney Docket No.: 01CON237P

<u>REMARKS</u>

This Amendment and Response is in response to the Non-Final Office Action of March

8, 2005, where the Examiner has rejected claims 1-38. By the present amendment, claim 20 has

been amended, and the Preliminary Amendment has been reinstated, which amended claims 13,

16 and 29, and added new claims 39-46.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Preliminary Amendment of March 8, 2003, which

was received by the PTO on March 14, 2003 (as shown on PAIR), be entered and considered in

the present application.

After the present amendment, claims 1-46 remain pending in the present application.

Reconsideration and allowance of outstanding claims 1-46 in view of the following remarks are

requested.

A. Rejection of Claims 1-38 under the Judicially Created Doctrine of

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-38 under the judicially created doctrine of

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent

Application Serial No. 10/464,291, filed on June 17, 2003.

Along with the present amendment, applicant has submitted a terminal disclaimer to

overcome the Examiner's rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type

double patenting with respect to claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/464,291,

filed on June 17, 2003. Applicant respectfully submits that the enclosed terminal disclaimer

overcomes the Examiner's rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type

double patenting.

Page 11 of 14

01M0001/US/2

Application Scrial No.: 09/965,745

Attorney Docket No.: 01CON237P

B. Objection to Claim 20

The Examiner has objected to claim 20 for reciting "an input capable of receiving ..." and

"a filter circuit capable of filtering ..." for not being positively recited claim limitations.

Applicant respectfully disagrees; however, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present

application, applicant has amended claim 20 to replace "an input capable of receiving" with -- an

input configured to receive--, and "a filter circuit capable of filtering" with --a filter circuit

configured to filter-. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection

has been overcome.

C. Rejection of Claims 20, 26 and 27 under 35 USC §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 20, 26 and 27, under 35 USC § 102(b), as being

anticipated by Cassing (C6x Solution for Voice Over IP Gateway) ("Cassing").

In rejecting claim 20, among other things, the Examiner states that Figure 9 of Cassing

discloses the filter circuit of claim 20. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20, as amended, reads in part "a filter circuit

configured to filter an answer tone from said first signal to generate a second signal." It is

respectfully submitted that Cassing fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the filter circuit of

Figure 9 is configured to filter an answer tone from the first signal to generate a second signal. In

fact, a review of Figure 9 of Cassing indicates that Figure 9 simply depicts a block diagram of an

Echo Canceller module for use in a telephone network. It is well known that the adaptive filter

of the Echo Canceller module of Figure 9 is configured to generate a model for the far signal,

Page 12 of 14

01M0001/US/2

Application Serial No.: 09/965,745 Attorney Docket No.: 01CON237P

which is then subtracted from the near signal to remove an echo signal of the far signal reflected

by the hybrid circuit of the telephone network or the near end environment. The adaptive filter of

the Echo Canceller module of Figure 9 is not configured to filter an answer tone.

Accordingly, it is respectfully that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over Cassing,

and claim 20 and its dependent claims 26 and 27 should be allowed.

D. <u>Claims 39-46</u>

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 39 should be allowed at least for

one or more reasons that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Further, claims 40-46 depend

from claim 39, and should be allowed at least for the same reasons.

Page 13 of 14

01M0001/US/2

Application Serial No.: 09/965,745 Attorney Docket No.: 01CON237P

E. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing reasons, an early Notice of Allowance directed to all claims 1-46 pending in the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted, FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP

Farshad Farjami, Esq

Reg. No. 41,014

FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP 26522 La Alameda Ave., Suite 360 Mission Viejo, California 92691 Telephone: (949) 282-1000 Facsimile: (949) 282-1002

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed by facsimile transmission to United States Patent and Trademark Office at facsimile number (703) 872-9306, on the date stated below.

3/30/05

Christma Carle